



1971

## The role of ethnic identification in determining source credibility of the athletic coach : a thesis ...

Thomas Gregory Pucci  
*University of the Pacific*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds)



Part of the [Health and Physical Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Pucci, Thomas Gregory. (1971). *The role of ethnic identification in determining source credibility of the athletic coach : a thesis ....* University of the Pacific, Thesis. [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds/1742](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/1742)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [mgibney@pacific.edu](mailto:mgibney@pacific.edu).

THE ROLE OF ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION IN DETERMINING SOURCE  
CREDIBILITY OF THE ATHLETIC COACH

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the Department of Health,  
Physical Education, and Recreation  
University of the Pacific

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

---

by  
Thomas Gregory Pucci  
May 1971

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	1
Importance of the Study . . . . .	1
Scope of the Study . . . . .	3
Delimitations . . . . .	3
Limitations . . . . .	4
Assumptions . . . . .	5
Statement of Hypotheses . . . . .	6
Definition of Terms Used . . . . .	6
Ethos . . . . .	6
Authoritativeness . . . . .	7
Character . . . . .	7
Credibility . . . . .	8
Latin American Group . . . . .	8
North American Group . . . . .	8
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	9
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	19
Subjects . . . . .	19
Procedure . . . . .	20
Semantic Differential . . . . .	23
Construction of the Speech . . . . .	26
Selection of Speakers . . . . .	27
Experimental Instrument Used . . . . .	28

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. THE RESULTS . . . . .	29
Analysis of the Data . . . . .	29
Primary Experimental Hypotheses . . . . .	30
Summary . . . . .	39
V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	42
Summary . . . . .	48
Suggestions for Further Research . . . . .	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	51
APPENDIX A . . . . .	54
Speech . . . . .	54
Directions for Semantic Differential . . . . .	58
Semantic Differential . . . . .	60
APPENDIX B . . . . .	61

# LIST OF TABLES

iii

TABLE	PAGE
I. Raw Scores of English Proficiency Test of Latin American Students at Elbert Covell College . . . . .	22
II. Least Squares Analysis of Co-Variance on Character Factor of Credibility . . . . .	32
III. Least Squares Analysis of Co-Variance on Authoritativeness Factor of Credibility . . . . .	33
IV. Least Squares Analysis of Co-Variance on the Co-Variant of Athletic Experience on the Authoritative Factor of Credibility . . . . .	34
V. Least Squares Analysis of Co-Variance on the Co-Variant of Athletic Experience on the Character Factor of Credibility . . . . .	35
VI. Group Means on the Authoritativeness Factor of the Credibility Scale . . . . .	61
VII. Group Means on the Character Factor of the Credibility Scale . . . . .	62
VIII. Comparison Of All Possible Variations of Group Interactions on the Character Factor of the Credibility Computed by the Scheffe Test . . . . .	63
IX. Comparisons Of All Possible Variations of Group Interactions on the Authoritativeness Factor of the Credibility Scale Computed By the Scheffe Test . . . . .	67
X. Raw Scores on the Authoritativeness and Character Factors of the Credibility Scale for Group AA . . . . .	71
XI. Raw Scores on the Authoritativeness and Character Factors of the Credibility Scale for Group ALA . . . . .	72
XII. Raw Scores on the Authoritativeness and Character Factors of the Credibility Scale for Group LAA . . . . .	73
XIII. Raw Scores on the Authoritativeness and Character Factors of the Credibility Scale for Group LALA . . . . .	74

## TABLE

## PAGE

XIV.	Raw Scores on the Authoritativeness and Character Factors of the Credibility Scale for Group LACA . . . . .	75
XV.	Raw Scores on the Authoritativeness and Character Factors of the Credibility Scale for Group ACA . . . . .	76

## LIST OF FIGURES

v

FIGURE	PAGE
1. 2 X 3 Analysis of Co-Variance for Measurement of Ethos . . . . .	24
2. Combinations of Treatments of Independent Variables . . . . .	31

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

We often hear of the credibility gap as being responsible for some of the problems we face in daily life. This phenomenon is not peculiar only to the field of politics or religion. As coaches meet with their athletes, perhaps a gap in credibility occurs, particularly when the coach is a member of one ethnic group and his athletes are members of another. Discontentment between athletes of varied ethnic backgrounds is no new issue. Perhaps scientific studies in this regard will serve to provide vital answers to important questions.

#### I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. Using a credibility scale that measures authoritativeness and character of a speaker as perceived by his audience, will a statistically significant difference arise where a figure of authority is a member of one ethnic group and those over whom the authority is asserted are members of a second ethnic group?

Importance of the study. Presently, the physical education instructor is faced with many problems such as overcrowded classes, inadequate facilities, and a very short period of time to actually teach the student. With these problems in mind, the instructor must be cognizant of the individual differences that each student represents in the



physical education setting.

The importance of this study is greatly enhanced in that the experiment was the first of its kind in the field of physical education. There are many studies which state the testimonies of discontented athletes and the experiences they have encountered, but these are descriptive studies and have not been conducted in an experimental setting. The present study dealt with the ethos of a coach as it was perceived by ethnic groups other than his own, a realistic situation that a coach may encounter during his career. Whether the present study detects either a difference in ethos ratings or no difference in ethos ratings, the coach will have valuable information that could be utilized and incorporated within his coaching techniques.

Greenberg and Miller state that a low-credible source makes an individual more resistant to change or persuasion.<sup>1</sup> This statement suggests that if a player or group of players on a team perceives a coach as a low-credible source, the coach should take measures to rectify the situation among his players if maximum potential from them is to be gained through his coaching.

McCroskey and Dunham state that research and analysis reported in their study lends support to the theory that ethos is a very important factor in persuasive communication.<sup>2</sup> This

---

<sup>1</sup>Bradley S. Greenberg and Gerald R. Miller, "The Effect of Low-Credible Sources on Message Acceptance," Speech Monographs XXXIII (June, 1966), 130.

<sup>2</sup>James C. McCroskey and Robert E. Dunham, "Ethos, A Confounding Element in Communication Research," Speech Monographs XXXIII (November, 1966), 463.

statement reinforces the importance of the present study in that if a coach of an athletic team is not perceived as a high-credible source, problems may arise among personnel.

Scope of the study. The scope of this study was limited to the testing of male subjects who were attending Elbert Covell College and College of the Pacific at the University of the Pacific. This experiment was also limited to the testing of two distinct groups of individuals: Caucasian North Americans and Latin Americans. All individuals who were members of ethnic groups other than the groups mentioned above were screened from the experiment so that a difference could be perceived from the two groups tested.

Delimitations. There were six groups tested in the present study. Two groups were of Caucasian North American descent and two were of Latin American descent. There were two control groups composed of Caucasian North American subjects from Elbert Covell College. This control was used to determine if there was a difference in ratings between Caucasian North Americans who attended Elbert Covell College and those who did not. By this measurement it could also be determined if any differences in ratings of the ethos of a speaker were due to association with Elbert Covell College.

There were twenty male subjects tested in each group, who were college students from the University of the Pacific. They heard a tape recorded speech from either a Caucasian North American or Latin American speaker who spoke upon discipline in athletics.

The source of data came from the semantic differential

measuring device scored by the audiences immediately following the presentation of speeches. The groups were selected by a random sampling of the classes in Elbert Covell College and interdisciplinary classes in College of the Pacific at the University of the Pacific.

Limitations. It was recognized that when dealing with Latin Americans from Elbert Covell College, many may not think of themselves as "Latins", but from their own home of origin in South America.

The present study could only attempt to show a rating difference between Caucasian North American and Latin American subjects at the University of the Pacific. The differences derived may be projected into these distinct groups, but this study cannot make any statements as to the rating differences of other ethnic groups. For this to occur, these particular groups must be tested.

It was also recognized that the speaker of Latin American descent may not have been perceived as such by all the subjects participating in the present study. Measures were taken to insure that the speaker's dialect was recognized by groups tested before the actual study took place, but to insure that all subjects did recognize the Latin American speaker when the actual experiment began was an unknown fact.

There was also a limiting factor in acquiring a true cross-section of students from Elbert Covell College and College of the Pacific. Measures were taken in an attempt to reach this goal, but again, this was possibly an uncon-

trollable factor.

There was also a problem in reaching a cross-section of Latin Americans who had reached different levels of English comprehension between the two "Latin" groups tested.

Assumptions. For the purposes of this study, it was assumed that students of Elbert Covell College from Latin America perceived themselves as a distinct group of individuals, separate from the Caucasian North Americans. It is true that these students come from many different countries of South America and their geographical origin is separated by thousands of miles, but it was assumed that they have a "Latin" bond which separates them from any other group.

The author has observed that individuals of Latin American origin group together when participating on an athletic team. By this fact and many other overt actions of these individuals, it could be assumed that the present study was definitely dealing with a distinct ethnic group.

It was assumed that the present study had selected a cross-section of subjects taken from the population of the University of the Pacific for both Caucasian, North American and Latin American groups.

It was further assumed that the Latin American speaker on the tape recorded message was recognized as an individual of "Latin" descent. A panel of instructors in speech communication judged the dialect of the speaker to be that of a "Latin". This judgement by experts in the field of communicative sciences reinforces the validity of the present study.

It was also assumed that the present study had a definite cross-section of Latin American subjects with different levels of English comprehension among the two "Latin" groups that participated.

Statement of hypotheses. The study hypotheses to be tested in the present study are stated in the following manner:

Hypothesis 1. There will be statistically significant differences in the comparisons of ethos ratings by Caucasian North American and Latin American groups as they rate a coach of a Caucasian North American group on the ethos semantic differential measurement device.

Hypothesis 2. There will be statistically significant differences in the comparisons of ethos ratings by Caucasian North American and Latin American groups as they rate a coach of a Latin American group on the ethos semantic differential measurement device.

## II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Ethos. A definition of ethos can be traced thousands of years to the time of Aristotle. This great figure in history listed good sense, good moral character, and good will as the qualities which "induce us to believe a thing apart from any proof of it".<sup>3</sup> But the results of a study conducted by Schweitzer and Ginsburg suggest the underlying factor of source credibility to be more complex than previously indicated.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Aristotle, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, trans. (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1954), pp. 85-86.

<sup>4</sup>Don Scheitzer and Gerald P. Ginsburg, "Factors of Communicator Credibility," in Problems in Social Psychology, ed. Carl W. Backman and Paul F. Secord (New York: F.S. Crofts & Co., 1966), pp. 94-102.

Authoritativeness. For purposes of this study, authoritativeness is defined as the extent to which a communicator is assessed to be a source of valid assertions by an audience (his "expertness").<sup>5</sup>

Hovland, Janis, and Kelley discuss this term extensively when they state:

A variety of characteristics of the communicator may evoke attitudes related to expertness. For example, the age of the communicator may sometimes be regarded as an indication of the extent of his experience. A position of leadership in a group may be taken as an indication of ability to predict social reactions. In certain matters persons similar to the recipient of influence may be considered more expert than persons different from him. Hence, the research on the factors of age, leadership, and similarity of social background may involve the expertness factor to some extent.<sup>6</sup>

Character. Character is defined as the degree of confidence of the audience in the communicator's intent to communicate the assertions he considers most valid (his trustworthiness).<sup>7</sup>

In Communication and Persuasion, Hovland, Janis, and Kelley also describe this term:

With respect to the second component of credibility, there have been numerous speculations about the characteristics of communicators which evoke attitudes of trust or distrust and about the consequences of these attitudes for acceptance of communications. One of the most general hypotheses is that when a person is perceived as having a definite intention to persuade others, the likelihood is increased that he will be perceived as having something to gain and, hence, as less worthy of trust. Thus it seems the

---

<sup>5</sup>Carl Hovland, Irving L. Janis, and Harold H. Kelley, Communication and Persuasion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), p. 22.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p.23.

successful speaker is one that is believed to have a high degree of sincerity by his audience.<sup>8</sup>

Credibility. In the present study credibility was used synonymously with ethos. Thus credibility was also defined as the image of a communicator held by a receiver at a given time.<sup>9</sup>

One has only to begin the text of the Rhetoric to discover that Aristotle lost no time in delving into a discussion of speaker credibility. He expressed the importance of this trait in the passage:

It is not true, as some writers of the art maintain that the probity of the speaker contributes nothing to his persuasiveness; on the contrary we might almost affirm that his credibility is the most potent of all means in persuasion.<sup>10</sup>

Latin American Group. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines the term "Latin" as "designating the peoples or countries whose languages and culture are descended from the Latin".<sup>11</sup> For purposes of the present study, this term was defined as individuals who originally came from countries of South America.

North American Group. This term was defined as all Caucasian North American individuals who participated in the present study enrolled in College of the Pacific and Elbert Covell College at the University of the Pacific.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>9</sup>Kenneth Andersen and Theodore Clevenger, Jr., "A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXX (June, 1963), 59.

<sup>10</sup>Aristotle, op. cit., p. 8.

<sup>11</sup>Webster, New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Co., Publishers, 1957), p. 475.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Experiments concerning the subject of ethos have dealt with many areas such as psychology, speech, sociology and education. This study deals with the credibility of a coach to an audience. Greenberg and Miller conducted a study to detect if a message from an unidentified source would result in a more favorable audience attitude than would a message attributed to a low-credible source. Forty-five subjects were selected from a semi-rural community. Four experiments were conducted in the study. They were: (1) the effect of low-credible and unidentified sources, (2) the effect of immediate vs. delayed identification of a low-credible source, (3) the effect of immediate vs. delayed identification of a low-credible source (partial replication) and, (4) a test of the effects of immediate vs. delayed identification of high and low-credible sources.<sup>12</sup>

The results of this experiment stated that in each experiment in which time of identification was manipulated, delayed identification of the low-credible source enhanced the persuasiveness of the message. The author states:

Individuals who heard a message following its attribution to a low-credible source seem to have been on their guard and to have been immunized against subsequent persuasion. In instances involving a low-

---

<sup>12</sup>Greenberg and Miller, op. cit., p. 136.



credible source, immediate identification appears to have served as a forewarning which alerted audience members to the fact that the message might be unreliable.<sup>13</sup>

There have been a great many experiments in the study of ethos which modify a communicator's image by stimuli which are not part of the actual presentation. This can be justified because ethos of the individual depends in part upon the reputation of the group to which he belongs.<sup>14</sup>

One such experiment related to this question of changing attitudes towards individuals is that of building an image. Annis and Meier attempted to create an image of an unknown source through planted editorials which linked the source with certain opinions and actions. The experimenters assumed they could predict whether the subjects of the experiment favored or opposed these opinions. As few as seven planted editorials generated the desired image, and most of the effects persisted over a period of four months.<sup>15</sup>

In another study conducted along similar lines, Kerstern compared two introductions. The first introduction employed techniques estimated by experts to build prestige of the speaker and to focus attention on him. The other introduction was constructed to create adverse effects. The person hearing the speech with the more favorable introduction

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 127.

<sup>14</sup>Andersen and Clevenger, op. cit., p. 68.

<sup>15</sup>Albert Annis and Norman Meier, "The Induction of Opinion Through Suggestion by Means of Planted Content," Journal of Social Psychology, V (1934), 65-81.

changed his opinion significantly more than did the individual who heard no introduction, or the poor introduction.<sup>16</sup>

It can be seen by these studies that ethos plays an important role in the determination of audience response.

A coach or physical educator should be aware of this role and the studies through which these important conclusions have been derived. This research may help the coach attain his goal and avert a situation that may have had its origin with lack of communication. James McCroskey and Robert Dunham in their article, "Ethos, A Confounding Element in Communication Research", concluded that the research and analysis reported supports the theory that ethos is a very important factor in persuasive communication.<sup>17</sup>

There were two hypotheses in this study: (1) an unseen, unknown, tape-recorded speaker in an experimental setting is a neutral-ethos source and, (2) an unseen, unknown, tape-recorded speaker in an experimental setting is a high-ethos source.<sup>18</sup>

The procedure for the experiment centered around the development of two topics with different versions. In one version on each topic there was extensive use of documented and qualified evidence. In the other version no documentation

---

<sup>16</sup>Barbara Kerstern, "An Experimental Study to Determine the Effect of a Speech of Introduction Upon the Persuasive Speech that Followed" (unpublished Thesis, South Dakota State College, 1958).

<sup>17</sup>McCroskey and Dunham, op. cit., p. 177.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 178.

was included. In the first experiment, measures of perceived authoritativeness and character of the speaker of post-communication attitudes were administered immediately after each speech. In addition, each subject completed a speech rating scale which included an item concerning the speaker's use of evidence.<sup>19</sup>

The second experiment of the study used only speeches on one of the chosen topics. The subjects were given the same tests as the former group. There were two experimenters present to administer the tests, and the subjects perceived the experimenters as at least high-ethos sources.<sup>20</sup>

The study concluded that the first hypothesis must be rejected. In all eight tests of the hypothesis, the obtained results corresponded to predictions appropriate when the source is presumed significantly above normal. Therefore, the second hypothesis was supported by the study.<sup>21</sup>

In a follow-up study by Paul Holtzman, the author reaffirmed the theory that ethos is a very important factor in persuasive speech. This study was conducted essentially in the same manner as the previous experiment and similar results were reported.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Paul D. Holtzman, "Conformation of Ethos as a Con-Element in Communication Research," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (November, 1966), 464-66.

In a study that used racial groups, Sidney Fraus suggested the possibility of evaluating indirect, implicative sources of ethos. Using pairs of individuals that were homogeneous and others that were heterogeneous, the author compared white and black people with respect to their persuasiveness in filmed discussions on segregation issues. The results indicated that arguments favorable to intergration were more persuasive when advanced by heterogeneous groups.<sup>23</sup>

A study that may have implications to this research project was conducted by Hovland and Mandell in an effort to assess more subtle sources of the speaker's image by manipulating credibility through suggestions of differing degrees of selfish interest and self-motivation. The nonsignificant difference in attitude change which the speaker produced was very small, but the audiences apparently reacted to these presumed prejudices and rated the "unbiased source" as significantly more honest of the two individuals. These evaluations were rendered after the speech which would indicate that the initial ethos of the two sources, the point at which the "biases" of one began to emerge, or the ways in which the images of the two speakers changed during the study could not be detected by the results of the study.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>Sidney Kraus, "An Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Negroes and Whites in Achieving Racial Attitude Change via Kinescope Recordings" (unpublished doctor's dissertation), Speech Monographs, XXVII (1960), 87-88.

<sup>24</sup>Carl Hovland and Wallace Mandell, "An Experimental Comparison of Conclusion Drawing by the Communicator and the Audience," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 581-88.

Another study that set out to assess the effects of prestige upon judgment of political and social issues was conducted by Hastorf and Piper. This study used a variety of problems to study the effects of supposed ratings of businessmen and educators on the attitudes of subjects. The experimenters found that all groups, including the one which was instructed to duplicate its prestige responses and ignore the supposed ratings, shifted significantly.<sup>25</sup>

A study that may have meaning to the physical educator and ethos is the experiment conducted by Weiss, who tested subjects with those elements of ethos which are designed to obtain attitude change and the possibility of producing differences in learning. Weiss taught responses to groups of students, one of which was told that the answers were false. No difference in learning occurred, but what was learned was correlated with the attitude change which took place during the experiment.<sup>26</sup>

There have been a few studies in the area of speech communication that deal with the measurement of ethos. Kulp apparently made the first attempt to develop an index of prestige based upon attitude. Groups were told that the responses supplied to them had been written by social scientists, educators, and other learned persons. The relative

---

<sup>25</sup>A. H. Hastorf and S. W. Piper, "A Note on the Effect of Explicit Instructions on Prestige Suggestion, "Journal of Social Psychology, XXXIII (1951), 289-293.

<sup>26</sup>Walter Weiss, "A 'Sleepers' Effect in Opinion Change," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, XLVII (1953), 173-180.

amounts of attitude shift toward each of these sources were used as a basis for computing a prestige index for each of the professional groups.<sup>27</sup>

Walter made the earliest effort to apply recognized test construction methods to the problem of creating a measurement device. His specific project was the development of an instrument to measure a single factor, the evaluation of character. Beginning with nearly four hundred character describing statements and employing the Thurstone sorting techniques and the Seashore rating methods, he developed two tests of twenty-two items each.<sup>28</sup>

The Osgood and Stagner study used a technique of bipolar nouns in a set of scales to rate occupations and occupational groups. This technique was a forerunner to the semantic differential. The study found that prestige of jobs and workers could be determined by the use of such scales.<sup>29</sup>

Andersen developed a semantic differential which would measure ethos of a speaker or group. Employing terms garnered from theoretical and experimental literature and securing responses to famous living people from freshman engineering and physical education classes, he obtained two major dimensions in the images. These two dimensions

---

<sup>27</sup>Daniel Kulp, II, "Prestige, as Measured by Single-Experience Changes and Their Permanency," Journal of Educational Research, XXVII (1934), 663-72.

<sup>28</sup>Otis Walter, Jr., "The Measurement of Ethos" (unpublished dissertation, Northwestern, 1948).

<sup>29</sup>Charles Osgood and Ross Stagner, "Analysis of Prestige Frame of Reference by a Gradient Technique," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXV (1941), 274-90.

were "evaluative and dynamism".<sup>30</sup>

Thus, many techniques of measurement have been applied to ethos. Among these devices are ranking, sociograms, prestige indexes, linear rating scales, Thurston scales, and semantic differentials. Each of these has proven useful in assessing one or more of the aspects in ethos.<sup>31</sup>

In the last few pages it has been attempted to review the related literature and experiments in the area of ethos in speech communication. Every study researched had some implication to the one being undertaken; however, the present study remains unique. In the review of literature in speech communication and physical education in an attempt to detect a similar study, three such experiments were found. Szalay and Lysne state that attitude data available on foreign groups is generally not enough for reconstructing their perception of a theme or problem. This study dealt with attitudes and the analysis of data detected a variety of different culturally specific denotative components.<sup>32</sup>

Another study by Jack Daniel dealt with white-black communications and was more concerned with verbal cues, emitted by white speakers, that lead to ineffective communication between white and black people. This study closely relates

---

<sup>30</sup>Kenneth E. Andersen, "An Experimental Study of Interaction of Artistic and Nonartistic Ethos in Persuasion" (unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1961).

<sup>31</sup>Andersen and Clevenger, op. cit., p. 76.

<sup>32</sup>Lorand B. Szalay and Dale A. Lysne, "Attitude Research for Intercultural Communication and Interaction," The Journal of Communication, XX (June, 1970), 180-200.

to the one being undertaken and justifies its relevance. Daniel stated that because of their life experiences, many blacks have a profound distrust for white speakers. He concluded by stating that "perceived" insincerity of a white speaker will be a significant factor which affects the communication between white and black people. The study identified many of the verbal indices that blacks use to judge the sincerity of white speakers.<sup>33</sup>

Along similar lines a study done by Ratcliff and Steil attempted to measure the attitudinal differences between white and black students. This was the first study done in an attempt to measure the attitudinal differences between white and black students toward social issues. All students were selected from speech classes. The study concluded that there appeared to be great differences in many areas which suggested communication in a speech class with a racially mixed enrollment could be difficult.<sup>34</sup>

With this in mind, this study was created in an attempt to delve into the current problem of coaching racial groups. It can be concluded that this is the first study done in this area of research. It is hoped that this study will be of great help to the physical educator in dealing with minority groups. Without communicating effectively to

---

<sup>33</sup>Jack L. Daniel, "The Facilitation of White-Black Communication," The Journal of Communication, XX (June, 1970), 134-41.

<sup>34</sup>Saron A. Ratcliffe and Lyman K. Steil, "Attitudinal Differences Between Black and White College Students," The Speech Teacher, XXIII (January, 1969), 69-74.



a team or a particular ethnic group on a team, a coach cannot hope to get a maximum effort from these individuals.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Subjects. Subjects for the present study were male members of randomly selected classes at the University of the Pacific during the Spring semester, 1971. Two classes of forty students from College of the Pacific participated as well as four classes or eighty students from Elbert Covell College, a college whose emphasis is Latin American studies and whose students are largely those of Latin American origin. The students from Elbert Covell College similarly represented a cross-section of college majors and were divided into two ethnic groups: those of Latin American origin and those of North American origin. The two groups of North American students from Elbert Covell College were used in the present study so that a control could be observed. The control was used in an attempt to determine the possible affects upon the North American students.

Subjects were screened only insofar as ethnic background was concerned. Due to the nature of the present study, it was imperative to preserve the ethnic homogeneity of each group. Those members of any ethnic group other than North American or Latin American were not included in the present study. Nor were these different ethnic groups mixed within treatment groups. One further procedure was followed in the selection of subjects: scores of English proficiency

examinations were obtained in order to assure a common level of proficiency with the English language with regard to subjects of Latin American origin. Table I presents English proficiency scores of Latin American students at Elbert Covell College used in the present study. Upon examination of these scores, it was found that the variable of language proficiency was randomly distributed among the subjects in the treatment groups and would therefore not affect the findings.

Procedure. In the third week of the Spring semester, 1971, an appointment was made with instructors of two classes from College of the Pacific and four classes from Elbert Covell College for purposes of obtaining the desired subjects for the present study. Appointments were made and experimentation commenced on Thursday and Friday of the following week. Subjects were told that they were taking part in a study conducted by a member of the University of the Pacific teaching staff and were introduced to the experimenter. The experimenter then instructed the subjects in completing the semantic differential scales by reading a set of instructions and having the subjects follow along on their own set (see Appendix A). They were then read a prepared statement pertaining to the speaker they were about to hear; "You are about to hear a coach of an athletic team from a well known university speaking upon his philosophy of athletics". The message was delivered through the means of a tape recorder. The tape recorder was used in the present study in an attempt to provide a speaking situation that would remain unchanged

through the various treatments. This procedure allowed the total speaking situations to be a constant. The audio taped message rather than closed circuit television was used in an attempt to eliminate any variables which might have entered into the study had closed circuit television been used. Variables such as gestures, facial expressions and appearance were avoided by the use of the audio tape.

After the message was heard, the experimenter instructed the subjects to rate the speaker on the semantic differential rating device before them. The subjects were given as much time as was required for all to finish completing the forms. After the subjects had completed the semantic differentials, the experimenter asked the subjects to turn their rating forms to the other side. The participants were then asked to mark a zero if they had never participated in a physical education class or on an athletic team, a number one if they had ever participated in a physical education class during their time in formal education, and a number two if they had ever participated on an athletic team that had a designated coach during their time in formal education. These instructions were also prepared beforehand and read to each treatment group.

The instrument for athletic experience was developed to assess any differences in responses between those who have participated on athletic teams and those who have not.

The semantic differential rating scales were collected and the subjects were thanked for their co-operation. The experimenter told each group that he would visit them once

TABLE I. Raw scores of English proficiency test of Latin American students at Elbert Covell College

Groups		Scores													
Group I	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
	123	122	118	117	110	101	101	97	97	93	85	82	82	81	
	15	16	17	18	19	20									
	81	80	80	73	69	69									
Group II	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13		
	118	116	114	114	109	105	103	100	100	99	98	93	87		
	14	15	16	17	18	19	20								
	81	79	78	71	71	70	67								

more during the semester and relate to them exactly what their part was in the overall experiment.

The treatment groups were determined in such a way as to obtain all possible variations of the relationship between speakers and groups tested. Figure 1 represents the treatment of speakers and groups following a 2 X 3 experimental design.

In testing North Americans from College of the Pacific, eight subjects who participated in the present study were not of North American descent. The data collected from these subjects were not included, as it was imperative that the Latin American and North American groups be pure and homogeneous.

All groups were randomly selected from classes at the University of the Pacific. This procedure was practiced in an attempt to give every sampling unit the same probability of being included within the present study as every other unit.<sup>35</sup>

Semantic differential. The semantic differential measuring device was selected for the present study because it has been shown to be a superior technique for measuring ethos.<sup>36</sup> As Andersen and Clevenger have pointed out in their survey of experimental research in ethos, the semantic

---

<sup>35</sup>Samuel R. Richmond, Statistical Analysis (New York: The Ronald Press, 1964), p. 325.

<sup>36</sup>Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957), p. 192.

Speaker	Audience		
	N. American	L. American	N. American*
N. American	1 1	1 2	1 3
L. American	2 1	2 2	2 3

---

\*Control. group of N. American students from Covell College

---

Fig. 1.---2 X 3 analysis of co-variance for measurement of  
ethos

differential has been frequently used in research of ethos and has been successful in assessing one or more of the aspects of ethos.<sup>37</sup> McCroskey, in a more recent report on the measurement of ethos, concluded that the semantic differential is a highly capable instrument for measuring ethos, either initial or terminal, on two factors or dimensions: character and authoritativeness.<sup>38</sup>

A twenty item, seven choice semantic differential scale was constructed for use as a post-treatment test of attitude toward the speaker. Scales used to measure the authoritativeness dimension of ethos were reliable-unreliable, informed-uninformed, valuable-worthless, qualified-unqualified, expert-inexpert, experienced-inexperienced, intelligent-unintelligent, and trained-untrained. Scales used to assess the character dimension of ethos were honest-dishonest, nice-awful, friendly-unfriendly, pleasant-unpleasant, virtuous-sinful, confident-unsure, mature-immature, energetic-tired, frank-secretive, just-unjust, easygoing-quick-tempered, and modest-boastful (see Appendix A).<sup>39</sup> To eliminate any possible set responses, the positive and negative ends of the bi-polar scales were alternated. For scoring purposes, the steps of each scale were assigned a value of 1 (positive) to 7 (negative). Each dimension of ethos was scored separately so that the subjects had two

---

<sup>37</sup>Andersen and Clevenger, op. cit., p. 78.

<sup>38</sup>James C. McCroskey, "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXIII (March, 1965), 70.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 72.



scores on the ethos semantic differential; one for authoritativeness and one for character of the speaker. The two scores were computed by totaling each scale of the measured dimension and dividing this number by the total number of scales used in that particular dimension being scored.

Construction of the speech. Only one version of the speech was constructed as the speech remained a constant. Overall construction of the speech was aimed at producing as authoritative an effect as possible with regard to ethos. The speech was constructed in this manner as it was felt that most coaches act in an authoritative manner where they make decisions and direct a group through a prescribed program. The speaker gave a short introduction by stating that athletics plays an important part in everyone's life. The main body of the speech was directed toward the audience describing the many hardships that one must endure to become an athlete. Throughout the speech the speaker constantly presented a philosophy of coaching in athletics which was one of discipline and dedication to the sport. The speaker attempted to appeal to the audience by asking many questions of them with such phrases as: "What would you do if"; and, "Are you willing to". The speaker quickly described his views in each instance by stating the phrase: "If you are a member of my team".

The speech was judged as being authoritative by a panel of experts in the field of speech communication. Although the speech was constructed in this manner,

there was no other attempt to add or detract from the speaker's ethos in the text of the speech. The language used in the speech contained no technical terms nor particularly vague statements which might detract from the speaker's ethos. The presentation attempted to represent an authoritative philosophy of a coach of an athletic team. The length of the speech was 969 words and took six minutes and forty-three seconds to deliver. It was a speech to persuade the audience on a particular philosophy on the subject of athletics thought to be held by many coaches throughout the nation. The speech was tape recorded on a Voice of Music tape recorder. The volume and pitch were placed exactly at the same level for both speakers.

Selection of speakers. Since the entire speaking situation was written for the speakers, the most important consideration in selecting a Latin American and North American speaker was to find individuals who had a definitely discernable "Latin" accent and North American accent. The individual selected to represent the "Latin" coach was a Latin American male who was in his middle twenties. He was judged to have a definite "Latin" accent by a panel of speech experts in speech communication.

The North American speaker was similarly selected with respect to dialect. The person selected was also a male in his middle twenties who was judged by the same panel of speech experts to be representative of a North American dialect.

The speakers were rehearsed both on and off the tape

recorder to assure that emphasis and tones were correct in an attempt to create greater probability that the subjects could acknowledge the speech as an authoritative and persuasive appeal. The speech was rehearsed numerous times by the speakers and recorded three times before the tape recorded speeches were acceptable for the study.

In addition to being able to deliver the speech in the properly discernable accent, the speaker had to qualify in his speaking ability as one who could fit the high ethos introduction that was given to the speakers in the present study. The speakers selected did meet these qualifications as judged by a panel of speech experts.

Experimental instruments used. As was stated previously, the semantic differential measurement scale for ethos was used to test the subject's attitudes toward a speaker. The data were analyzed by computer using a two way analysis of co-variance with athletic experience as the co-variant. Significant F scores did result, which meant that significant differences among groups did result attributable to factors other than chance; thus the Scheffe<sup>e</sup> test was used to ascertain whether significant differences between any pair of group means existed.<sup>40</sup> The semantic differentials were hand scored and entered onto data sheets for computer analysis.

---

<sup>40</sup> Janet T. Spence and others, Elementary Statistics (New York: Meredith Corporation, 1968), p. 167.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE RESULTS

Analysis of the data. For the primary experimental hypotheses the analysis of co-variance was chosen to provide an overall test of differences between the effects of the six treatments. The co-variant was athletic experience. By using a co-variant analysis, the experimenter was able to determine to what extent, if any, a particular variable, in this case athletic experience, influenced the rest of the findings. The Scheffe test was used to assess levels of difference between individual treatment groups. This test was incorporated into the study only after a significant  $F$  ratio of the analysis of co-variance was found. This test permits the experimenter to compare any pair of means that are selected from the findings and places no limits on the number of comparisons that may be made with any set of data. The Scheffe is calculated by first subtracting the sums of individual scores of the two groups being compared. This number is then squared and divided by the total number of scores in both groups, multiplied by the mean square error. The number found must then be compared to a pre-determined value to determine significance. The result is read as an  $F$ .

Primary experimental hypotheses. The primary experimental hypotheses are stated in the null as follows:

Hypothesis 1. There will be no statistically significant differences in the comparisons of ethos ratings by Caucasian North American and Latin American groups as they rate a coach of a Caucasian North American group on the ethos semantic differential measurement device.

Hypothesis 2. There will be no statistically significant differences in the comparisons of ethos ratings by Caucasian North American and Latin American groups as they rate a coach of a Latin American group on the ethos semantic differential measurement device.

Since the primary experimental hypotheses were stated in the null as they previously appeared, a two-tailed test was used. The two-tailed or two-sided test is always used when there is no prior hypothesis as to the direction of differences.<sup>41</sup> Using the F ratio, the region for rejection of the null hypothesis was equal to or beyond the .05 percentile point. Fig. 2. presents the combinations of treatments of independent variables. Table II presents the analysis of variance for treatment groups 1-6, on the character factor of credibility only. Table III includes similar data for the authoritativeness factor on the credibility measure. Tables IV and V present the data for the F ratio for the co-variant of athletic experience on both the character and authoritativeness factors of the credibility measure.

---

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.

Cell	Speaker	Audience	Abbreviation
1 1	N. American	N. American	AA
1 2	N. American	L. American	ALA
1 3	N. American	N. American (Covell)	ACA
2 1	L. American	N. American	LAA
2 2	L. American	L. American	LALA
2 3	L. American	N. American (Covell)	LACA

Fig. 2.---Combinations of treatments of independent variables.

TABLE II. Least squares analysis of co-variance on  
character factor of credibility

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Squares	F
Speakers	.30	1	.30	1.03
Audiences	2.05	2	1.03	3.54*
Speakers X Audiences	18.56	2	9.28	31.99**
Error	33.06	114		
Total	53.96	119		

\*P < .05

\*\*P < .01

TABLE III. Least squares analysis of co-variance on  
authoritativeness factor of credibility

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f	Mean Square	F
Speakers	2.31	1	2.31	5.90**
Audiences	12.17	2	6.08	15.54**
Speakers X Audiences	8.63	2	4.31	11.02**
Error	44.62	114		
Total	67.73	119		

\*\*p < .01



TABLE IV. Least squares analysis of co-variance on the co-variant of athletic experience on the authoritativeness factor of credibility

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Speakers	.68	1	.68	2.82
Audiences	.95	2	.48	1.99
Speakers X Audiences	.45	2	.23	.94
Error	27.25	114		
Total	29.33	119		

TABLE V. Least squares analysis of co-variance on the co-variant of athletic experience on character factor of credibility

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Squares	F
Speakers	.68	1	.68	2.82
Audiences	.95	2	.48	1.99
Speakers X Audiences	.45	2	.23	.94
Error	27.25	114		
Total	29.33	119		

The analysis of the data detected that the variable of athletic experience made no difference on the authoritativeness or the character factor of the credibility measure. Thus, adjusted character and authoritativeness  $F$  ratio scores for athletic experience were not used to determine significant differences among groups and speakers.

An overall comparison of the two speakers with the two audiences of different ethnic origin yielded significant  $F$  ratios on the authoritativeness factor of the credibility scale only. That is, when looking at each speaker as he was rated by different audiences, the  $F$  ratio scores obtained on the authoritativeness factor only differed significantly.

When an overall comparison was made of the audiences with the two speakers, there were significant  $F$  ratio scores on both the authoritativeness and character scales of the credibility measure.

When all possible combinations of speakers and audiences were analyzed, it was found that a difference beyond the .01 level of significance did exist, while a similar effect was detected on the character factor. Therefore, further comparative analysis between groups was justified.

Table VIII (Appendix B) includes data on the results of the Scheffe' test on the character factor of the credibility measure, while Table IX (Appendix B) indicates the findings of the Scheffe' test for the authoritativeness factor. For the results to be significant at the .05 level, a critical value of 11.50 was needed. A value of 15.40 was needed for

significance at the .01 level of confidence. The results of the Scheffe test indicated several instances of significant differences when one specific treatment group was compared with another specific treatment group. On the authoritativeness scale, the Latin American audience rated the North American speaker significantly different from the ratings of the same speaker by the North American audience beyond the .01 level of confidence and was positive toward ethnic agreement. Further, the North American audience rated the North American speaker significantly different from the Latin American speaker. The difference was similarly significant beyond the .01 level of confidence and was positive toward ethnic agreement.

On the character scale, there was no statistically significant difference when the Latin American audience rated the North American speaker as compared with the North American audience rating the North American speaker. However, the North American audience rated the North American speaker significantly different from the Latin American speaker. The difference was significant beyond the .01 level and, once again, was positive toward ethnic agreement.

A comparison of treatment group AA (North American speaking to North American audience) to treatment group ACA (North American speaker speaking to the Control) was made for purposes of assessing any differences that might have occurred as the result of North Americans having attended Elbert Covell College. It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences in this regard and the results of

the comparison substantiated that view on both the character and the authoritativeness factors of the credibility scale. Also, there were no significant differences when treatment group LAA (Latin American speaking to North American audience) and LACA (Latin American speaker speaking to Control group) were compared on both factors of the credibility scale.

When a comparison of the North American and Latin American speakers speaking to the Latin American audiences was made, a significant difference was detected at the .05 level of confidence on the authoritativeness factor of credibility. However, there was no statistical significance when the same groups were compared on the character factor of the credibility scale.

On the authoritativeness scale, the North American speaker was rated significantly different by the Latin American audience as compared to the control group of North Americans from Elbert Covell College. Again, the group means were in the direction of positive ethnic agreement. There was no significant difference when the same groups were analyzed on the character factor of the credibility scale.

When a comparison of treatment group LAA (Latin American speaker speaking to North American audience) to treatment group LALA (Latin American speaking to Latin American audience) was made, the North American audience rated the Latin American speaker significantly different from the ratings by the Latin American audiences. The same result occurred on the character factor of the credibility. In both cases the significance was beyond the .01 level of

confidence and was again positive toward ethnic agreement.

The results of the comparison of group LALA (Latin American speaker speaking to Latin American audience) to group LACA (Latin American speaker speaking to the Control) indicated that significant differences did occur between the two groups, but only on the authoritativeness scale of credibility. As was the case throughout the findings, there was a positive indication toward ethnic agreement on both factors of the credibility scale, even where no significance was found.

A comparison of group LACA (Latin American speaker speaking to the Control) to group ACA (North American speaker speaking to the Control) indicates that significant differences did occur at the .01 level of confidence on both factors of the credibility scale. Once again, ethnic agreement was evident.

Summary. The result of the two-way analysis of covariance detected that athletic experience made no difference on the authoritativeness or the character factor of the credibility measure of the sample populations examined. The analysis of variance detected significant overall  $F$  ratio scores among the speakers and groups which were tested.

The Scheffe' test indicated significant differences on the authoritativeness factor when the following individual group comparisons were made: treatment group AA (North American speaker speaking to North American audience) to group AIA (American speaker speaking to Latin American

audience); group AA (North American speaking to North American audience) to group LAA (Latin American speaker speaking to North American audience); group ALA (American speaker speaking to Latin American audience) to group LALA (Latin American speaking to Latin American audience); group ALA (American speaker speaking to Latin American audience) to group ACA (North American speaker speaking to the Control); group LAA (Latin American speaking to North American audience) to group LALA (Latin American speaking to Latin American audience); group LALA (Latin American speaking to Latin American audience) to group LACA (Latin American speaker speaking to the Control); and group LACA (Latin American speaker speaking to the Control) to group ACA (North American speaker speaking to the Control). Significant differences were found on the character factor for the following individual group comparisons: group AA (North American speaking to North American audience) to group LAA (Latin American speaking to North American audience); group LAA (Latin American speaking to North American audience) to group LALA (Latin American speaking to Latin American audience); and group LACA (Latin American speaker speaking to the Control) to group ACA (North American speaker speaking to the Control).

The results strongly suggested ethnic agreement with the speaker or audience. An empirical assessment of the differences between group means shows that in every case an audience of ethnic origin coinciding with that of the speaker rated the speaker higher on character and authoritativeness factors of the credibility scale than the same audience rated

a speaker of different ethnic origin. In the instances in which significant differences were found the null hypotheses are rejected.



## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

As was indicated in Table III, the  $F$  ratio score for the speaker variable was significant beyond the .01 level of confidence on the authoritativeness factor, but did not reach a level of significance on the character factor. This indicates that when considering the same speaker speaking to different audiences, a significant difference in audience ratings on the credibility measure was obtained; however, the significant difference in this regard was on the authoritativeness factor only. The  $F$  ratio for the audience variable was significant on both factors of credibility; however, the level of confidence was higher on the authoritativeness factor. These results imply that, in the overall analysis, the manipulation of ethnic groups produced significant differences in the ratings of the speaker; however, the authoritativeness factor of credibility seemed to be effected more so than was the character factor.

Within the limitations of the present study, it seems reasonable to conclude that when a coach of Latin American origin addresses an audience of North Americans or when a coach of North American origin addresses an audience of Latin American origin, there will be significant differences in the way he is perceived as a credible source. This implies that audiences of different ethnic backgrounds perceive the speaker's qualifications on varying levels.

When all possible combinations of speakers and groups were analyzed, the overall  $F$  ratio scores on the authoritativeness and character factors were greatly significant at the .01 level. In this case the character factor of the credibility measure was greater than that of the authoritativeness factor. This result would seem to indicate that when all possible combinations of speakers and groups were analyzed together, a significant difference on the character factor was achieved, greater than that of the authoritativeness factor, a result which can be attributed to the total variance of all the treatment groups.

When the Scheffe' test was used to detect significant differences between individual groups, great degrees of significance were found. As was indicated in Tables VIII and IX, when the North American speaker spoke to a North American and then to a Latin American audience, a significant difference was found beyond the .01 level on the authoritativeness factor, but no significant difference was found on the character factor of the credibility scale. More specifically, the North American speaker was rated lower by the Latin American audience than by the North American audience. The fact that the character factor did not yield differences that were significant implies that the speaker's character is not the credibility factor being challenged in a specific instance where ethnic groups are manipulated; it is the expertise or authoritativeness of the speaker that produces perception differences. The implication of this finding is that when a North American coach is faced with a

Latin American audience, his audience will perceive his expertise as being much lower than will the North American audience.

A similar situation occurred when the Latin American speaker spoke to the North American and Latin American groups. In this instance the differences on both factors of the credibility scale were significant at the .01 level of confidence. It was shown that the Latin American speaker was rated lower by the North American audience than by the Latin American audience. The fact that the Latin American speaker was rated significantly lower on both factors of credibility implies that both factors are being challenged in a specific situation where a Latin American speaker is being rated on the credibility scale.

By the results of the two comparisons already made, the findings imply that Latin Americans will rate a coach of a different ethnic background lower on the authoritativeness scale only, while the North Americans will rate the Latin American speaker lower on both factors of the credibility measure. This finding may suggest the possibility that Caucasian North Americans will perceive an individual of a different ethnic origin as a lower credible source than would the Latin American audience who rated the North American speaker significantly lower only on the authoritativeness scale.

A comparison of the Latin American speaker speaking to a North American audience and the North American speaker speaking to a North American audience produced significant

differences at the .01 level of significance on both factors of the credibility scale. These findings again imply ethnic agreement; that is, the North American audiences perceived the North American speaker as a more highly credible source than they did the Latin American speaker.

When the speakers were interchanged with both audiences being Latin American, there was a significant difference on the authoritativeness factor, but at a lower level of significance than that of a similar comparison with the two audiences being North American. When the character factor was observed, there was no significant difference between the two groups. This finding again implies that the Latin Americans perceive no differences in the character of the speaker, but they challenge the authoritativeness factor of credibility. The implication of this finding is that when a North American coach is faced with a Latin American audience, his audience will perceive his expertise as being much lower than will a North American audience. This finding indicates the character of the North American coach, that is, his trustworthiness, sincerity and honesty, made little difference as to how he was perceived by both the Latin American and North American audiences on the credibility measure.

When the North American speaker remained a constant and the audiences were both North Americans from the College of the Pacific and North Americans from Elbert Covell College, no significant differences were found on either factor of the credibility measure. This finding seems to imply that there was no significant difference with regard to the control

group's ratings as compared to the North American group's rating of both speakers on the credibility scale.

When again the constant was the North American speaker and was compared with the Latin American audience and the control group from Elbert Covell College, a significant difference was found on the authoritativeness factor beyond the .01 level of significance, but no significance was found on the character factor of the credibility scale. This result is very similar to the comparison of the North American speaker speaking to the Latin American and North American groups. In this comparison a significant difference on the authoritativeness scale was found, but no significance was found on the character scale.

When a comparison was made of the Latin American speaker speaking to North Americans from College of the Pacific and North Americans from Elbert Covell College, no significance was obtained on either factor of the credibility scale. This finding implies that there were no significant differences as to how the North Americans rated the Latin American speaker as compared to the ratings of the speaker by the control group.

A comparison of the Latin American speaker speaking first to a Latin American and then to a control group of North Americans from Elbert Covell College produced significant differences on the authoritativeness factor of credibility only. This finding differs from the results obtained when the North American group was used rather than the control. The North American group rated the Latin American

speaker as a less credible source on both factors of the credibility scale, while the control group rated the Latin American speaker significantly lower on only the authoritativeness factor. This single instance of the control group of North American students from Elbert Covell differing from their own ethnic group of North Americans does not seem to imply significant differences between these two groups. In every other case where North American students from Elbert Covell College were contrasted with North Americans, no differences were found. Even in this case where the groups disagreed as to character ratings, significance was almost reached, as is indicated in Table VIII (Appendix B).

When two control group audiences heard a Latin American speaker and a North American speaker, significant differences were found on both factors of the credibility scale. More specifically, the Latin American speaker was rated lower by the control group at the .01 level of significance. This finding implies that the control group of North Americans from Elbert Covell College perceived a speaker of similar ethnic origin as a more credible source than the speaker who was not.

In each case where one specific group was compared to another specific treatment group, the group means always pointed toward ethnic agreement. In every case the Latin American, North American, and Elbert Covell College North American groups rated speakers who were ethnically similar higher on both factors of the credibility scale. There were no exceptions to this. Table VI and VII illustrate the group means for both factors of the credibility scale.

Summary. The present study was designed to detect whether the athletic coach's credibility would be perceived differently by ethnic groups other than his own; more specifically, when a North American or Latin American speaker is speaking to similar or dissimilar ethnic audiences. The review of literature revealed that the present study was the first of its kind in the field of physical education.

Subjects for the present study were male members of randomly selected classes at the University of the Pacific. Only subjects of Latin American and North American origin participated in the present study in an attempt to keep each treatment group pure and homogeneous. Those members of any ethnic group other than Latin American or North American were not included in the present study. Neither were these different ethnic groups mixed within treatments. There were six treatment groups used in the present study: two groups of North Americans from the College of the Pacific; two groups of Latin Americans from Elbert Covell College; and two groups of North Americans from Elbert Covell College.

Two speakers were used in the present study: one of North American origin and the other of Latin American origin. The speaker's message was aimed at producing as authoritative an effect as possible with regard to ethos.

The treatment groups were determined in such a way as to obtain all possible variations of the relationship between speakers and groups.

After the message was heard, the experimenter instructed the subjects to rate the speaker on the semantic differential rating device. This device measured the speaker on two factors of credibility: authoritativeness and character.

The data were analyzed by computer using a two way analysis of co-variance with the athletic experience of each subject as the co-variant. The analysis of the data detected that the variable of athletic experience made no difference on either factor of the credibility scale .

Significant F ratio scores did result, which meant that significant differences among groups may have resulted; thus the Scheffe test was used to ascertain wherein those differences did lie.

Within the limitations of the study and the methods employed, the following conclusions seem justified:

1. A Latin American coach who speaks to a North American audience is likely to be rated lower on both factors of credibility as compared to to a situation where his audience is ethnically identical, or Latin American.
2. A North American coach who speaks to a Latin American audience is likely to be rated lower on the credibility scale than he would be if his audience were in ethnic agreement, or North American; however, the lower rating is likely to occur on the authoritativeness factor only.

These conclusions imply that the credibility of a North American coach involves expertise only, while the findings indicate that the Latin American coach has a greater deficit to overcome as the North American audiences seem to judge him negatively on both factors of the credibility scale.



It was the intent of the experimenter to provide data which would serve to work toward a solution to the problem of the credibility gap which may exist between the athlete and coach when there are ethnic differences. With the data presented herein, it is hoped that an important step toward the solution has been taken; a realization of the problem has been reached. It is for further researchers to explore methods for reducing such variances in ethnic differences in credibility perceptions.

Suggestions for further research. From the results of the present study, many suggestions and ideas arise for further research in the study of the credibility of an athletic coach. A similar study that could be conducted with only minor changes in the methodology would be to conduct the same study with the medium of video tape.

It is also suggested that the present study should be conducted again with the use of other ethnic groups such as blacks. Many problems have come about when athletic coaches are dealing with ethnic groups different from their own. It might be revealing to conduct a similar study in an attempt to determine if other ethnic groups perceive individuals of their own ethnic origin as more credible sources than individuals who are not of similar origin.

The present study was designed to measure attitudes of athletes toward coaches when varying ethnic groups were in evidence. In an effort to further assess credibility differences among ethnic groups, a study could be designed to measure attitude of coaches toward athletes of ethnic groups different from their own.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. BOOKS

- Aristotle, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, trans., New York: Wiley & Sons, 1964.
- Hovland, Carl, Irving L. Janis, and Harold Kelley. Communication and Persuasion.
- Osgood, Charles, George Suci, and Percy Tannenbaum. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Richmond, Samuel B. Statistical Analysis. New York: The Ronald Press, 1964.
- Spence, Janet T. and others. Elementary Statistics (New York: Meredith Corporation, 1968), p. 167.
- Webster. The New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Company, Publishers, 1957.

### B. PERIODICALS

- Andersen, Kenneth E. and Theodore Clevenger. "A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos." Speech Monographs, XXX (June, 1963), 59-78.
- Annis, Albert and Norman Meier. "The Induction of Opinion Through Suggestion by Means of Planted Content," Journal of Social Psychology, V (1934), 65-81.
- Cromwell, Harvey. "The Persistency of the Effect of Argumentative Speeches," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLI (April, 1955), 154-58.
- Daniel, Jack L. "The Facilitation of White-Black Communications," The Journal of Communications, XX (June, 1970), 134-41.
- Greenberg, Bradley S. and Gerald R. Miller. "The Effects of Low-Credible Sources on Message Acceptance," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (June, 1956), 127-36.

- Hastorf, H.A. and G.W. Piper. "A Note on the Effect of Explicit Instructions on Prestige Suggestion," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXIII (1951), 289-93.
- Holtzman, Paul D. "Confirmation of Ethos as a Confounding Element in Communication Research," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (November, 1966), 464-66.
- Hovland, Carl and Wallace Mandell. "An Experimental Comparison of Conclusion Drawing by the Communicator and the Audiences," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 581-88.
- Kraus, Sidney. "An Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Negroes and Whites in Achieving Racial Attitude Change via Kinescope Recordings," Speech Monographs, XXVII (1960), 87-88.
- Kulp, Daniel, II. "Prestige as Measured by Single-Experience Changes and Their Permanency," Journal of Educational Research, XXVII (1934), 663-72.
- McCroskey, James C. "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXXII (March, 1965), 65-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_, And Robert Dunham. "Ethos: A Confounding Element in Communication Research," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (November, 1966), 456-63.
- Osgood, Charles and Ross Stanger. "Analysis of a Prestige Frame of Reference by a Gradient Technique," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXV (1941), 275-90.
- Ratcliffe, Sharon and Lyman K. Steil. "Attitudinal Differences between Black and White Students," The Speech Teacher, XXIII (January, 1969), 190-98.
- Schweitzer, Don and Gerald Ginsburg. "Factors of Communicator Credibility," in Problems in Social Psychology, ed. Carl Backman and Paul F. Second, New York: Crofts & Company, 1966, 94-102.
- Szalay, Lorand B. and Dale A. Lysne. "Attitude Research for Interculture Communication and Interaction," The Journal of Communication, XX (June, 1970), 180-200.
- Weiss, Walter. "A ' Sleeper ' Effect in Opinion Change," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1953), 173-80.
- Whitehead, Jack L., Jr. "Factors of Source Credibility," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LIV (February, 1968), 59-63.

## C. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Andersen, Kenneth E. "An Experimental Study of Interaction of Artistic and Nonartistic Ethos in Persuasion." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1961.

Kerstern, Barbara. "An Experimental Study to Determine the Effect of a Speech of Introduction upon the Persuasive Speech that Followed," Unpublished Master's thesis, South Dakota State College, 1958.

Walter, Otis, Jr., "The Measurement of Ethos," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Northwestern University, 1948.

## APPENDIX A

### Authoritative Speech Used in Experimental Treatment

Though you might not think about it, athletic events play a prominent part in our lives. Aside from the hundreds of local athletic events going on in every corner of this great country of ours, think about the television air time devoted to athletics. Every weekend, you have the opportunity to view an athletic event for almost the entire weekend and on special days, like New Year's, you can watch football solidly from ten o'clock in the morning to ten o'clock at night. Whether you agree or disagree with this exposure, it is irrelevant to the point that athletics play a big role in our lives, especially when you can consider the millions of television viewers who do sit glued to their sets watching that big game.

Most of you in this room have probably thought at one time or another how wonderful it would be to be a great athlete. Many of you might have been successful in athletics. True, there is a great deal of glory that goes along with this activity with the large crowds watching and admiring you participate. I just wonder how many of you have ever thought of all the work that goes into playing that one game a week, scoring that touchdown or making that game winning basket. Not many people think of the tedious practices that must be to make a team function as such. Suppose you go out for an athletic team. You must compete with many others who are attempting the same fete as you. Can you sacrifice and

discipline yourself to take the physical punishment that is a part of all athletic endeavors? Are you willing to give and take with your fellow teammates in an attempt to create a healthy atmosphere? Suppose you are the best player on the team. If you are not willing to endure the many hardships that it takes to make a team function, you will be dropped from the squad. There is more that goes into athletics than just how good a person is in ability; you must be able to think of the team first and yourself second. You must be able to get along with the other members of the team even if you dislike many of them. This is why athletics are so valuable to us in our society.

This question then becomes apparent! How does a coach get the maximum from every player and make a group of individuals function and think the same way? As can be assumed, as a player you are expected to be at practice daily. It is a generally accepted rule, if a player continually misses practice, he will be dropped from the squad. The first time you miss practice, you may be called into the coach's office and reprimanded for the action. If for an unknown reason you again miss practice, you will more than likely be dropped from the team. Usually there are no exceptions to this rule unless the player confers with the coach before his absence. Most coaches, this one included, strongly encourage the players to call the field house or gym if they are sick or must miss practice for an emergency. I have always felt that no individual is good enough to miss practice and be indispensable to the team because it is felt



that a team should function as such, with everyone treated equally. So-you're the best on the team, but- you are undisciplined to team rules- we must part company- there is no place for you on a team that is to be a team.

Many fellow coaches have very few training rules, if any at all. My philosophy is that an individual must sacrifice and discipline himself if he is to achieve a maximum effort. My rules include no drinking and smoking during the season. Also a bed check is always conducted the night before all games. All players are expected to be in bed by 10:00 p.m. the night before the game. Every individual is to be on the field in full practice uniform at a designated time. Punctuality is a very important asset to develop in life. Practices are always very tough and the players need every ounce of energy they have; thus, we encourage them to keep their social life to a minimum. I feel by implementing these rules and enforcing them to the greatest extent, we are helping the individual achieve his goal.

Most coaches stress teamwork, knowing without it, a maximum effort cannot be reached. We always stress this concept to the greatest extent. There is no place for individuals who think more about how they look and how many points they score than if the team wins or loses. This causes dissension among players which cannot be tolerated; players having the described attitudes are dropped from the squad.

The sacrifice, the discipline, the sweat, all of

this makes a team look so beautiful for that Saturday game. Any of you who decides to go out for an athletic team, remember that it is not all the glory that it may seem. Behind that minute of glory that everyone in the stadium sees are many, many hours of hard, dedicated work. We never see these hours, but they are there and the proof is how the team functions in the game.

Many criticize athletics by arguing that it teaches individuals to win at all costs. If you go out for my team, we always feel that it is no disgrace to lose, but it is when you haven't played your best, and your best is your team's best!

### Instructions

You are asked to complete a form the nature of which may be unfamiliar to you. You will see pairs of terms which could be considered questions about a particular thing. For example, if asked to evaluate Richard Nixon, you would respond:

tall   X   :        :        :        :        :        :        short

or

tall        :        :        :        :        :        :   X   short

if you think your answer to the question is very closely related to the term at either end of the scale;

if you think your answer to the question is quite closely related to either end of the scale, answer:

tall        :   X   :        :        :        :        :        short

or

tall        :        :        :        :        :   X   :        short

if you think that your answer is only slightly related to either end of the scale, answer:

tall        :        :   X   :        :        :        :        short

or

tall        :   X   :        :        :   X   :        :        short

Finally, if you think that your answer is irrelevant to the scale or is neutral to the scale, answer:

tall        :        :        :   X   :        :        :        short

- IMPORTANT: (1) Place your X's in the middle of the spaces.  
(2) Check every scale; omit none.  
(3) Never mark more than one X on a single scale.

Your answers to one question should not depend on your answers to any other questions. Make each item a separate and independent judgement.

YOU HAVE BECOME SOMEWHAT ACQUAINTED WITH A SPEAKER IN THE  
PAST FEW MINUTES. NOW RATE HIM BELOW.

reliable \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_unreliable  
dishonest \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_honest  
informed \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_uninformed  
nice \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_awful  
worthless \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_valuable  
friendly \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_unfriendly  
qualified \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_unqualified  
inexpert \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_expert  
experienced \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_inexperienced  
unintelligent \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_intelligent  
pleasant \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_unpleasant  
virtuous \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_sinful  
trained \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_untrained  
unsure \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_confident  
immature \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_mature  
energetic \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_tired  
frank \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_secretive  
unjust \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_just  
easygoing \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_quick-tempered  
boastful \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_modest

## APPENDIX B

TABLE VI. Group Means on the Authoritativeness Factor of the Credibility Scale

Treatment Group	Group Mean	Range	SD	Standard Error $\bar{X}$
AA	1.931	1.250-2.625	.4164	.0955
ALA	2.737	1.375-3.867	.6286	.1442
LAA	2.919	1.250-4.625	.9452	.2168
LALA	2.059	1.250-2.750	.4544	.1042
LACA	2.813	1.500-4.000	.7559	.1734
ACA	1.883	1.750-3.167	.3289	.0754

TABLE VII. Group Means on the Character Factor of the Credibility Scale

Treatment Group	Group Mean	Range	SD	Standard Error $\bar{X}$
AA	2.401	1.500-3.750	.6144	.1409
ALA	2.422	1.750-3.417	.4223	.0968
LAA	3.450	2.333-4.833	.6765	.1552
LALA	2.643	1.683-3.508	.5288	.1213
LACA	3.134	1.750-3.917	.5282	.1211
ACA	2.281	1.250-2.375	.3780	.0867



TABLE VIII. Comparison of all possible variations of group interactions on the character factor of the credibility scale computed by the Scheffe test

$\Sigma$ AA	46.340
$\Sigma$ ALA	48.700
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F <sup>-</sup>	.478
$\Sigma$ AA	46.343
$\Sigma$ LAA	69.009
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F <sup>-</sup>	44.288**
$\Sigma$ AA	46.343
$\Sigma$ LALA	52.875
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F <sup>-</sup>	3.657
$\Sigma$ AA	46.343
$\Sigma$ LACA	62.680
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F <sup>-</sup>	16.337

TABLE VIII (Continued)

$\Sigma$ AA	46.343
$\Sigma$ ACA	45.623
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F'	.045
$\Sigma$ ALA	48.700
$\Sigma$ LAA	69.009
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F'	35.556**
$\Sigma$ ALA	48.700
$\Sigma$ LALA	42.857
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F'	1.489
$\Sigma$ LAA	69.009
$\Sigma$ ACA	45.623
MS error	.290
d.f.	224.
F'	47.074**
$\Sigma$ LALA	52.857
$\Sigma$ LACA	62.682

TABLE VIII (Continued)

MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F	8.321
$\chi^2$ LALA	52.857
$\chi^2$ ACA	45.623
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F	4.511
$\chi^2$ LACA	62.680
$\chi^2$ ACA	45.623
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F	25.018**
$\chi^2$ ALA	48.700
$\chi^2$ LACA	62.680
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F	16.848**
$\chi^2$ ALA	48.700
$\chi^2$ ACA	45.623
MS error	.290

TABLE VIII (Continued)

---



---

d.f.	114.
F	.816
$\chi^2$ LAA	69.009
$\chi^2$ LALA	52.857
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F	17.835**
$\chi^2$ LAA	69.009
$\chi^2$ LACA	62.680
MS error	.290
d.f.	114.
F	3.453

---

\*  $P < .01$ \*\* $P < .05$

TABLE IX. Comparison of all possible variations of group interactions on the authoritativeness factor of the credibility scale computed by the Scheffe test

$\Sigma$ AA	38.625
$\Sigma$ ALA	54.742
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
F <sup>-</sup>	16.651**
$\Sigma$ AA	38.625
$\Sigma$ LAA	58.375
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
F <sup>-</sup>	25.003**
$\Sigma$ AA	38.625
$\Sigma$ LAIA	41.175
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
F <sup>-</sup>	.416
$\Sigma$ AA	38.625
$\Sigma$ LACA	56.250
MS error	.390
d.f.	114
F <sup>-</sup>	19.912**

TABLE IX (Continued)

$\Sigma$ AA	38.625
$\Sigma$ ACA	37.667
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
$F'$	.058
$\Sigma$ ALA	54.742
$\Sigma$ LAA	58.375
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
$F'$	.846
$\Sigma$ ALA	54.742
$\Sigma$ LALA	41.175
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
$F'$	11.798*
$\Sigma$ ALA	54.742
$\Sigma$ LACA	56.250
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
$F'$	.145
$\Sigma$ ALA	54.742
$\Sigma$ ACA	37.667

TABLE IX (Continued)

---

MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
F	18.689**
$\Sigma$ LAA	58.375
$\Sigma$ LALA	41.175
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
F	18.924**
$\Sigma$ LAA	58.375
$\Sigma$ LACA	56.250
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
F	.298
$\Sigma$ LAA	58.375
$\Sigma$ ACA	37.667
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
F	27.488**
$\Sigma$ LALA	41.117
$\Sigma$ LACA	56.250
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
F	14.679*

$\chi^2$ LALA	41.117
$\chi^2$ ACA	37.667
MS error	.390
d.f.	114.
F	.762

---

\*  $P < .05$

\*\* $P < .01$



TABLE X. Raw scores on the authoritativeness and character factors of the credibility scale for group AA.

Subject	Authoritativeness	Character
1	1.875	1.750
2	2.375	2.083
3	1.875	3.167
4	2.125	2.584
5	2.250	2.750
6	2.375	1.667
7	2.375	2.916
8	1.500	2.083
9	1.500	2.333
10	2.500	3.083
11	1.625	3.083
12	1.250	1.500
13	1.750	2.500
14	2.375	3.750
15	1.500	2.167
16	1.500	1.500
17	2.625	2.917
18	1.500	2.093
19	1.750	2.583
20	2.000	2.917

TABLE XI. Raw scores on the authoritativeness and character factors of the credibility scale for group ALA

Subject	Authoritativeness	Character
1	2.750	2.500
2	2.625	2.667
3	2.000	2.000
4	3.867	1.833
5	2.125	2.500
6	1.375	1.750
7	3.000	2.083
8	2.875	2.167
9	3.125	3.417
10	3.375	3.167
11	3.000	2.608
12	3.125	2.750
13	2.750	2.417
14	1.500	1.750
15	2.625	2.333
16	3.000	2.508
17	3.250	2.917
18	2.125	2.500
19	3.250	2.750
20	3.000	2.083

TABIE XII. Raw scores on the authoritativeness and character factors of the credibility scale for group LAA

Subject	Authoritativeness	Character
1	2.375	2.333
2	1.500	2.667
3	2.250	3.583
4	4.000	3.417
5	1.250	3.508
6	3.375	4.000
7	4.000	3.917
8	4.000	4.000
9	3.375	4.083
10	3.500	3.417
11	3.125	3.833
12	1.250	2.833
13	2.625	2.917
14	4.625	4.833
15	2.250	2.167
16	2.250	3.417
17	3.500	4.417
18	2.875	3.500
19	3.000	3.000
20	3.250	3.167

TABLE XIII. Raw scores on the authoritativeness and character factors of the credibility scale for group LALA

Subject	Authoritativeness	Character
1	2.625	3.508
2	2.375	3.083
3	1.500	2.083
4	1.625	2.667
5	2.000	2.000
6	1.375	2.083
7	2.750	3.333
8	2.625	3.167
9	1.875	3.250
10	1.375	3.083
11	1.250	2.167
12	1.875	1.683
13	2.375	2.750
14	2.375	2.917
15	2.125	2.667
16	2.500	3.083
17	2.000	2.000
18	2.125	2.250
19	2.425	2.583
20	2.000	2.500

TABLE XIV. Raw scores on the authoritativeness and character factors of the credibility scale for group LACA

Subject	Authoritativeness	Character
1	1.500	2.833
2	3.125	3.500
3	3.000	3.083
4	2.875	3.000
5	2.250	2.167
6	3.500	3.500
7	3.500	3.500
8	1.625	1.750
9	3.500	3.000
10	3.500	3.508
11	2.375	3.417
12	3.875	3.917
13	2.500	3.583
14	4.000	3.583
15	1.625	3.500
16	2.375	2.508
17	3.250	3.000
18	3.250	3.414
19	2.125	3.000
20	2.500	2.917

TABLE XV. Raw scores on the authoritativeness and character factors of the credibility scale for group ACA

Subject	Authoritativeness	Character
1	2.000	2.167
2	1.250	2.000
3	1.750	2.583
4	2.000	2.000
5	2.250	2.500
6	1.875	3.167
7	1.667	2.375
8	1.500	2.000
9	1.750	2.583
10	2.500	2.000
11	1.875	1.750
12	2.000	2.000
13	1.875	1.750
14	1.500	2.167
15	2.000	2.500
16	2.375	2.583
17	2.375	2.915
18	2.000	2.000
19	1.500	2.083
20	1.625	2.500